

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS:**

Entry of the above amendments, and reconsideration of the claim rejections, as they might apply to the original and amended claims in view of these remarks, is respectfully requested. Please cancel claim 9 without prejudice or disclaimer of the subject matter contained therein. Claims 1, 3-8, 10-16, and 18-20 remain in the application. In this Response, claims 1, 3-8, 10-16, and 18-20 have been amended.

No new matter has been introduced through any of these claim amendments.

**A. Interview Summary**

Applicant would like to thank Examiner Tan for the telephone interviews that were held on September 5, 2007 and October 3, 2007. A summary of the September 5<sup>th</sup> meeting is as follows:

We discussed claim 8 regarding the claimed application program interface, and whether or not the cited reference to Joseph teaches an API. No agreement was reached, and we both agreed to look into this issue further.

A summary of the October 3rd meeting is as follows:

Proposed amended claims 1, 8, and 14, which were sent to Examiner Tan via facsimile prior to the telephone interview, were discussed. No agreement was reached on the amended claims as the change in scope would require a new search. Applicant indicated that a Request for Continued Examination would be filed with further claim amendments as discussed with Examiner Tan.

**B. Rejection of Claims  
Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)**

The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 3-16, and 18-20 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Joseph, U.S. Patent No. 5,873,106.

In response, Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 8, and 14 to more distinctly distinguish Applicant's invention through the further limitations of:

(claim 1)

receiving 404 a measure call to the parent object, wherein said measure call retrieves a set of constraints for the parent object, and an established measure parameter and an established arrange parameter of the child object;

determining 406 if said established measure parameter and said established arrange parameter are valid;

when either of said established measure parameter and said established arrange parameter are set as invalid, determining 410 if said established measure parameter is valid;

when said established measure parameter is valid, calling 414 an arrange child helper routine FIG. 6 to determine a final size for the child object, wherein said arrange child helper routine evaluates a set of constraints for the child object;

when said established measure parameter is invalid, calling 420 a measure child helper routine to determine a desired size of said child object, wherein said measure child helper routine evaluates said set of constraints for the child object in respect to said set of constraints for the parent object; and

calling said arrange child helper routine to determine said final size for the child object.

(claim 8)

receive a measure call to the parent object to retrieve a set of constraints for the parent object, and an established measure parameter and an established arrange parameter of the child object, wherein if either of said established measure parameter and said established arrange parameter are set as invalid, determining if said established measure parameter is valid, and if so, call an arrange child helper routine to determine a final size for the child object, wherein said arrange child helper routine evaluates a set of constraints for the child object, and when said established measuring parameter is invalid, call a measure child helper routine to determine a desired size of said child object, wherein said measure child helper routine evaluates said set of constraints for the child object

in respect to said set of constraints for said parent object, and then call said arrange child helper routine to determine a final size for the child object.

(claim 14)

receiving 404 a measure call to a parent object, wherein said measure call retrieves a set of constraints for said parent object, and an established measure parameter and an established arrange parameter of said child object;

determining 406 if said established measure parameter and said established arrange parameter are valid;

when either of said established measure parameter and said established arrange parameter are set as invalid, determining 410 if said established measure parameter is valid;

when said established measure parameter is valid, calling 414 an arrange child helper routine FIG. 6 to determine a final size for said child object, wherein said arrange child helper routine evaluates a set of constraints for said child object;

when said established measure parameter is invalid, calling 420 a measure child helper routine to determine a desired size of said child object, wherein said measure child helper routine evaluates said set of constraints for said child object in respect to said set of constraints for said parent object; and

calling said arrange child helper routine to determine said final size for said child object.

Support for these amendments may be found in the specification on pages 10-16 and in reference to FIGS. 4, 5, and 6. Applicant submits that Joseph does not teach nor suggest the additional limitations of checking to see if either a measure parameter (the object size) or an arrange parameter (the object's position or orientation) of the child object is invalid, and when at least one is invalid and it is not the measure parameter, calling an arrange child helper routine to determine a final size for the child object. Or, when the measure parameter is invalid, calling first a measure child helper routine to determine a desired size of the child object, and then calling the arrange child helper routine to determine a final size of the child object. Joseph requires a high level geometry management policy, implemented by a geometry manager, where

the policy is bound to a graphical configurable container that defines a geometric shape for encapsulating a child object. The geometry management system specifies parameters through negotiation among the child objects, the containers, and the high level geometry manager (col. 4, lines 51-53). Since the Joseph reference does not disclose expressly or inherently all of the elements and limitations of Applicant's amended claims 1, 8, and 14, Applicant believes that these claims are not anticipated by Joseph and requests withdrawal of the Examiner's rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(b).

Claims 3-7, 10-13, and 15, 16, and 18-20 depend directly or indirectly from independent claims 1, 8, or 14 and include all the elements and limitations thereof. As a result, and in light of the foregoing remarks concerning independent claims 1, 8, or 14, Applicant likewise believes that dependent claims 3-7, 10-13, and 15, 16, and 18-20 also overcome the Examiner's rejection based on Joseph under 35 U.S.C. §102(b), and withdrawal of that rejection in respect to these claims is respectfully requested.

**CONCLUSION:**


Thus, a bona-fide attempt has been made to ensure that the application meets all statutory requirements and is in condition for allowance. The Examiner's early indication to that effect is, therefore, courteously solicited.


If a telephone conference would expedite allowance or resolve any additional questions, such a call is invited at the Examiner's convenience.

Applicant has authorized a charge against a deposit account for the fees due with this Amendment. Please charge any additional required fees, or fees under 37 C.F.R. 1.17, if any are due with this response, or credit any overpayment to, deposit account 13-2725. Please consider this a Petition For Extension Of Time for a sufficient number of months to enter this correspondence, or any future reply, if appropriate, for an extension of time for its timely submission.

Respectfully submitted,

MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.  
P.O. Box 2903  
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-0903  
(303) 357-1632

By:   
Stanley J. Gradisar, Esq., Reg. No. 42,598  
Attorney for Applicant



Date: October 9, 2007